BEFORE THE
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Implementation of the Pay Telephone Reclassification and Compensation Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996	)	CC Docket No. 96-128
	)	
Illinois Public Telecommunications Association, Petition for a Declaratory Ruling Regarding the Remedies Available for Violations of the Commission's Payphone Orders	)	

COMMENTS OF THE
ATLANTIC PAYPHONE ASSOCIATION, INC.

Albert H. Kramer
Allan C. Hubbard
Dickstein, Shapiro Morin & Oshinsky, LLP
2101 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037-1526
(202)828-2226

Attorneys for The Atlantic Payphone Association, Inc.

August 26, 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BEFORE THE
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of	)	
Implementation of the Pay Telephone Reclassification and Compensation Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996	)	CC Docket No. 96-128
Illinois Public Telecommunications Association, Petition for a Declaratory Ruling Regarding the Remedies Available for Violations of the Commission's Payphone Orders	)	

COMMENTS OF THE
ATLANTIC PAYPHONE ASSOCIATION, INC.

The Atlantic Payphone Association, Inc. ("APA") supports the Illinois Public Telecommunications Association's ("IPTA's") petition for a declaratory ruling that payphone service providers ("PSPs") are entitled to refunds back to April 15, 1997 for charges assessed by the Bell Operating Companies ("BOCs") and other incumbent local exchange carriers' ("ILECs'")[1] for payphone lines to the extent that such charges exceed rate levels that comply with the *Wisconsin Order's*[2] new services test criteria. APA also

[1] IPTA argues that all ILECs, not just the BOCs, are required to provide refunds.

[2] *In the Matter of Wisconsin Public Service Commission: Order Directing Filings*, Bureau/CPD No. 00-01, Memorandum Opinion and Order, FCC 02-25, 17 FCC Rcd. 2051 (Jan. 31, 2002)(*"Wisconsin Order") aff'd sub nom. New England Public Communications Council, Inc. v.* FCC, 334 F.3d 69 (D.C. Cir. 2003), *cert. denied*, 124 S. Ct. 2065 (2004).

supports IPTA's position that ILECs that fail to provide such refunds are not entitled to retain the dial-around compensation such ILECs have collected since April 15, 1997.

The IPTA arguments that apply to refunds for payphone line rates in Illinois and the retention by Illinois ILECs of dial-around compensation also apply to refunds due PSPs and ILEC retention of dial-around compensation in other jurisdictions, including the District of Columbia and Virginia. As APA shows below, Verizon inequitably has been enjoying the *quid* of dial-around compensation without delivering on the *quo*: its affirmative duty to provide PSPs in the District of Columbia and Virginia new services test-compliant payphone rates, and to pay applicable refunds retroactive to April 15, 1997.

I. STATEMENT OF INTEREST

The APA is a trade association whose members provide payphone services in the District of Columbia, Maryland and Virginia. APA has reached a settlement with Verizon with regard to payphone line rates in Maryland.[3] However, in the District of Columbia and Virginia, PSPs are still paying Verizon payphone line rates that *prima facie* fail to meet the Commission's new services test. A Commission ruling on the refund and dial-around retention issues raised in the subject IPTA petition will have a significant effect on APA members. As such, APA has a vital interest in the outcome of this proceeding.

---

3 *See* Public Service Commission of Maryland Order No. 78534 issued June 25, 2003 in *Inquiry into the Payphone Tariffs of Bell Atlantic Maryland, Inc.*, Case No. 8763.

II. VERIZON HAS ACKNOWLEDGED THAT REFUNDS BACK TO APRIL 15, 1997 ARE DUE WHEN PAYPHONE LINE RATES ARE NOT NEW SERVICES TEST COMPLIANT

A 1997 statement by Verizon's counsel in a new services test proceeding before the Maryland Public Service Commission reflects Verizon's clear understanding of its obligation to pay refunds when its payphone line rates do not comply with the new services test. In response to a question regarding the applicability in the Maryland proceeding of the Commission's *Second Waiver Order* requiring refunds or credits back to April 15, 1997.[4] Verizon counsel stated:

> [T]he FCC, in ruling on the federal tariffs for the same, some of the same services that are before you today, has . . . directed that we keep an accounting and make any adjustments retroactive. We do not have a similar arrangement in Maryland, but *we would not disagree that to the extent that there is a finding that requires an adjustment of any of the tariffs that are now in effect, in order to comply with the federal new services test, that those rates would be effective to April 15, 1997 and appropriate adjustments, whether they be refunds or increases, would be made accordingly.*

Inquiry into Pay Phone tariffs of Bell Atlantic-Maryland, Incorporated, Maryland Public Service Commission, Case No. 8763, Pre-hearing Conference, July 11, 1997, Tr. at 18 (emphasis added) (the cover page and pages 16-18 of the Transcript of that pre-hearing conference are attached as Appendix A). The fact that this statement by Verizon counsel was made in July 1997 shortly after the April 1997 release of the *Second Waiver Order* underscores Verizon's full understanding that the Commission's ground rules

---

4 *Pay Telephone Reclassification and Compensation Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996,* Order, 12 FCC Rcd 21370, 21379-80, ¶ 20 (CCB 1997) (*"Second Waiver Order"*).

require refunds back to April 15, 1997 if rates do not comply with the new services test. As a result of that Maryland proceeding, Verizon has filed revised rates in Maryland.[5]

III. VERIZON'S PAYPHONE LINE RATES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND VIRGINIA ARE *PRIMA FACIE* NON-COMPLIANT WITH THE *WISCONSIN ORDER'S* NEW SERVICES TEST

Despite Verizon's acknowledgement that its rates must "comply with the federal new services test," Verizon has done nothing to adjust the rates it charges PSPs in the District of Columbia and Virginia since the Commission's *Wisconsin Order*. Although Verizon's rates in the District of Columbia and Virginia have not yet been found non-compliant with the new services test,[6] they are on their face inconsistent with the test's

---

5 *See* n.3, *supra*.

6 The Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia ("DC PSC"), when presented with the issue, found that Verizon's payphone line rates complied with the new services test. TT97-5 *Application of Bell Atlantic – Washington, D.C., Inc, to amend the General Regulations Tariff, P.S.C. – D, C– No. 201, Local Exchange Services Tariff, P.S.C. – D.C. – No. 202, General Service Tariff, P.S.C. – 203, and Connection with Telephone Company Facilities Tariff, P.S.C. – D.C. – No. 205* Order No. 11543 issued November 16, 1999 (copy attached as Appendix B). However, that order was adopted prior to the new services test guidance provided by the Commission in the *Wisconsin Order*. Indeed, the DC PSC order was issued prior to the Common Carrier Bureau's order in *Wisconsin Public Service Commission*, Order, 15 FCC Rcd 9978 (CCB 2000).

In Virginia, the State Corporation Commission declined to exercise jurisdiction over the issue and referred parties to the Commission for payphone line rate compliance with federal guidelines. *Petition of PayTel Communications, Inc. et al, For rejection of and investigation of tariffs filed by Virginia local exchange carriers pursuant to § 276 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Final Order dated May 11, 2001 in Case No. PUC970029. (copy attached as Appendix C).

requirement that the BOC not double-recover the subscriber line charge ("SLC"):[7]

> Under the new services test, the BOC may not charge more for payphone line service than is necessary to recover from PSPs all monthly recurring direct and overhead costs incurred by BOCs in providing payphone lines. The forward-looking cost studies used to make these determinations are usually calculations of total costs, not jurisdictionally separated costs. If an incumbent BOC files in its state tariff a charge that fully recovers these unseparated costs and also assesses on the PSP its federally tariffed SLC, the BOC will over-recover its costs, and the PSP will over-pay, in violation of the new services test and the cost-based rates requirement of the *Payphone Orders*.[8]

In both the District of Columbia and Virginia, Verizon assesses PSPs a federal SLC on top of its tariffed payphone line rates. *See* Verizon's payphone line tariffs for the District of Columbia and Virginia attached as Appendices D and E, respectively, and the sample excerpts from Verizon invoices for payphone lines in the District of Columbia and Virginia attached as Appendices F and G, respectively. Verizon's assessment of the SLC without an offset in the tariffed rates is in clear violation of the new services test as articulated above in the *Wisconsin Order*.

When Verizon's tariffed payphone line rates in the District of Columbia and Virginia are scrutinized in a rate proceeding, the rates will have to be reduced at least by the amount of the SLC. The rates, in all likelihood, would have to be reduced much further to comply with the new services test. Verizon did not reduce payphone line rates in the District of Columbia or Virginia with its 1997 tariff filings that purportedly complied with the new services test, but largely maintained rates at their high, pre-April 15, 1997 level. Accordingly, review of Verizon's payphone line rates in the

---

7 The SLC is sometimes referred to as the end user common line or EUCL charge.

8 *Wisconsin Order* at 2070, ¶ 60.

District of Columbia and Virginia should result in reductions well in excess of the amount of the SLC. APA intends to pursue a review of Verizon's District of Columbia and Virginia payphone line rates.

As IPTA has clearly demonstrated in its petition and as the American Public Communications Council ("APCC") has compellingly shown in its concurrently filed comments, a Commission ruling that PSPs are entitled to refunds is needed to resolve conflicting state commission interpretations of the Commission's orders and to redress Verizon's and other BOCs' failure to bring their rates into compliance with the new services test and their non-compliance with Commission's orders regarding refunds. APA will not repeat, but supports and adopts IPTA's and APCC's arguments for a Commission ruling mandating refunds where BOC payphone line rates have been shown to be excessive.

IV. VERIZON, BY FAILING TO FILE POST-*WISCONSIN ORDER* NEW SERVICES TEST-COMPLIANT RATES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND VIRGINIA AND PAY REFUNDS, HAS PATENTLY VIOLATED A CONDITION OF ITS ELIGIBILITY FOR COLLECTING DIAL-AROUND COMPENSATION

More than a year after Verizon exhausted its appeal of the *Wisconsin Order*, Verizon has failed to take steps even to reduce its tariffed payphone rates in the District of Columbia or Virginia by the amount of its federal SLC, much less make the other new services test adjustments required by the *Wisconsin Order*, and pay the refunds that Verizon has recognized will be due. Verizon apparently is attempting to shift the burden and expense to PSPs of initiating regulatory action to force Verizon to file new rates.

The Commission, in any ruling on the IPTA petition, should make clear that Verizon engages in such tactics at great financial peril: compliance with the new services test retroactive to April 15, 1997 was an explicit condition set by the Commission in allowing the BOCs to collect dial-around compensation and a failure to satisfy that condition will jeopardize a BOC's right to retain that compensation. To date, Verizon, in the District of Columbia and Virginia, has not only failed to satisfy that condition but has not even made the pretense of seeking to come into compliance.

V. CONCLUSION

For more than seven years, Verizon has retained excessive payphone line revenues and denied PSPs and the consuming public in the District of Columbia and Virginia the benefits of lower payphone line rates. The Commission has in its arsenal an effective and legitimate weapon – the threat of lost dial-around revenues – for finally bringing Verizon and other BOCs into compliance. The time has come for the Commission to wield that weapon.

The Commission should grant IPTA's petition and declare that a failure by the BOCs to bring their payphone line rates promptly into compliance with the new services test in all jurisdictions, and to pay applicable refunds, with interest, retroactive to April 15, 1997 will be deemed a failure to comply with the condition that made the BOCs eligible for receipt of dial-around compensation.

Respectfully submitted,

/Allan Hubbard

Albert H. Kramer
Allan C. Hubbard
Dickstein, Shapiro Morin & Oshinsky, LLP
2101 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037-1526
(202) 828-2226

Attorneys for The Atlantic Payphone Association, Inc.

Dated: August 26, 2004

DSMDB.1814039.1

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that, on August 26, 2004 , a copy of the foregoing Comments of The Atlantic Payphone Association, Inc was served by electronic mail and/or U. S. Mail, on the following parties as indicated below:

By Electronic Mail

Jon Stover
Pricing Policy Division
Wireline Competition Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
Room 5A-365
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, D.C. 20554
jon.stover@fcc.gov

Best Copy and Printing, Inc.
Portals II
445 12th Street SW
Room CY-B402
Washington, D.C. 20554
fcc@bcpiweb.com

By Electronic and U.S. Mail

Michael W. Ward, Esq.
Illinois Public Telecommunications Association
1608 Barclay Blvd.
Buffalo Grove, Illinois 60089
mwward@dnsys.com

Kenneth D. Colson

DSMDB.1815395.1

APPENDIX A

COPY

VOLUME I

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF MARYLAND

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - :

IN THE MATTER OF THE INQUIRY	:	
INTO THE PAY PHONE TARIFFS OF	:	CASE NO. 8763
BELL ATLANTIC-MARYLAND,	:	
INCORPORATED	:	Prehearing Conference

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - :

Public Service Commission
William Donald Schaefer Tower
6 St. Paul Street
16th Floor Hearing Room
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

Friday, July 11, 1997 - 10:00 a.m.

BEFORE:

ROBERT H. McGOWAN
Hearing Examiner

Reported by:
Carla M. Sinclair, RPR

SALOMON REPORTING SERVICE, INC.
Baltimore, Maryland
(410) 539-6760 FAX (410) 539-8696

MR. KRAMER: Your Honor, I want to raise one matter. I apologize to my co-counsel and the other parties because I did neglect to mention this when we were discussing the scope of the proceeding.

There is an issue here that under a waiver granted by the FCC to Bell Atlantic giving Bell Atlantic until May 19th to file the tariffs in question which had originally been due under the FCC's pay phone order May 15th, there is a question of refunds. As a condition of that waiver, Bell Atlantic and several of the other RBOCs pledged that any rate adjustments made as a result of any of the, any failure to have the tariffs, to have filed new tariffs, would be retroactive to April 15th.

That of course is, it is an issue that arises as a result of the federal waiver, and, again, we did not discuss this as part of the scope of the hearing. We want it to be clear that we view it as fairly embraced by the filings because the question was whether the tariffs are in effect. We want to state our position for the record.

Again, I'm sorry we didn't discuss it during the break here, during the off-the-record discussion.

HEARING EXAMINER McGOWAN: It's your statement -- are you trying to say that there is an issue whether it would be retroactive to April or to May or whether there's an issue as to whether it would be retroactive at all? The question is not clear to me, the point of disagreement.

MR. KRAMER: Your Honor, I have to -- well, one of the issues that the parties have agreed is an issue here or at least embraced within the Commission's order is that there will be testimony on the question of the usage rate. As we agreed, we will then argue the relevance and how that exactly fits at such time as it is appropriate.

Our position would be that any rate adjustment made to any COCOT tariff, any service provided to COCOTs is retroactive to April 15th.

HEARING EXAMINER McGOWAN: If I understand, from what you've said, there's an agreement signed by Bell Atlantic as to retroactivity, is that correct?

MR. KRAMER: It is a condition on a waiver granted by the FCC. I don't know how Bell Atlantic presented -- actually, I do know. It was in a letter signed by their counsel as part of a Bell Company coalition to the FCC.

MS. ROUDIEZ: I want to address that point.

HEARING EXAMINER McGOWAN: We will hear from

Bell Atlantic before I say anything further. Go ahead.

MS. ROUDIEZ: There is no agreement as such, but in the FCC, in ruling on the federal tariffs for the same, some of the same services that are before you today, has by its order on June 3rd directed that we keep an accounting and make any adjustments retroactive. We do not have a similar arrangement in Maryland, but we would not disagree that to the extent that there is a finding that requires an adjustment of any of the tariffs that are now in effect, in order to comply with the federal new services test, that those rates would be effective to April 15, 1997, and appropriate adjustments, whether they be refunds or increases, would be made accordingly.

HEARING EXAMINER McGOWAN: Just for my enlightenment, is Bell Atlantic-Maryland currently keeping records which would be adequate to make this adjustment, if necessary, for Maryland?

MS. ROUDIEZ: Yes.

HEARING EXAMINER McGOWAN: All right. It doesn't appear that we have a disagreement here at this time, and we will just see if one develops as we go along. It doesn't appear there's any disagreement now.

MR. KRAMER: Thank you.

APPENDIX B

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
717 14TH STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

ORDER

November 16, 1999

TT97-5, IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF BELL ATLANTIC - WASHINGTON, D.C., INC. FOR AUTHORITY TO AMEND THE GENERAL SERVICES REGULATIONS TARIFF, P.S.C .- D.C. - NO. 201, LOCAL EXCHANGE SERVICES TARIFF, P.S.C. - D.C NO. 202, GENERAL SERVICES TARIFF, P.S.C. - D.C. NO 203, CONNECTION WITH TELEPHONE COMPANY FACILITIES TARIFF, P.S.C. - D.C. NO. 205, **Order No. 11543**

I. INTRODUCTION

On January 15, 1997, Bell Atlantic-Washington, D.C., Inc. ("BA-DC") filed an application with the Public Service Commission of the District of Columbia ("Commission") requesting authority to amend the General Regulations Tariff, P.S.C. - D.C. - No. 201, Local Exchange Services Tariff, P.S.C. - D.C. - No. 202, General Service Tariff, P.S.C. - No. 203, and Connection with Telephone Company Facilities Tariff, P.S.C. - D.C. - No. 205. Specifically BA-DC requested authority to amend its tariff in order to comply with Federal Communications Commission's ("FCC") payphone orders implementing the payphone provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 ("Act").[1] The Commission found, among other things, that BA-DC has not subsidized its payphone operations through intrastate subsidies and approved BA-DC's Application on April 15, 1997.[2]

However, on May 15, 1997, the Peoples Telephone Company ("PTC") filed an Application for Partial Reconsideration of that Order asserting that the Commission failed to consider FCC orders that require rates for a local exchange carriers' (LECs) payphones to satisfy the "new services" test. In addition, PTC contends that the Commission improperly reviewed only the cost data for coin line services to determine that BA-DC's payphone services were not subsidized instead of basing its

---

1 Application of Bell Atlantic - Washington, D.C., Inc. to amend the General Regulations Tariff, P.S.C. - D.C. - No. 201, Local Exchange Services Tariff, P.S.C. - D.C. - No. 202, General Service Tariff, P.S.C. - No. 203, and Connection with Telephone Company Facilities Tariff, P.S.C. - D.C. - No. 205 filed, January 15, 1997 ("Application"). See also, In the Matter of Implementation of the Pay Telephone Reclassification and Compensation Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Report and Order, CC Docket No. 96-128 and CC Docket No. 91-35 (released September 20, 1996) and Order on Reconsideration, CC Docket No. 96-128 and CC Docket No. 91-35 (released November 8, 1996) (collectively, the "Payphone Orders").

2 TT97-5, Order No. 10967 (April 15, 1997).

decision on an evaluation of current cost data for each of the payphone services that BA-DC offers.[3] PTC requests that the Commission re-examine BA-DC's tariffs for its Customer-provided Coin and Credit Card Operated Telephone Service ("COCOTS") lines, Audiotex Call Blocking, Line Side Answer Supervision and Call Screening Service and reconsider its finding that BA-DC is not subsidizing its payphone operation.[4] On May 28, 1997, BA-DC filed reply comments contending, in part, that PTC's Petition is moot as it relates to COCOT service features because BA-DC filed cost data in TT97-11 showing that its payphone services are not subsidized and that they comply with the FCC's "new services" test.[5]

II. DECISION

Under the current tariff, BA-DC provides rates, terms and conditions for lines and features currently used by BA-DC in the provision of its public and semi-public services and makes these services available to competitive payphone service providers.[6] The tariff offers two payphone lines: 1) Network Controlled Coin Line ("NCCL"); and 2) Network Controlled Non-coin Line ("NCNL"). NCCL is a dial tone line, message rate, local exchange service for use with coin-operated payphones. NCNL is a local exchange service, used with coinless payphones, which prevents the completion of chargeable direct-dialed local or toll calls without operator assistance. COCOTS is an individual line, that is a message rate local exchange service, designed for use with station controlled pay telephones used by the general public and is the service currently used by independent payphone providers to provide competitive payphone services.

---

3 TT97-5, Application for Partial Reconsideration of Peoples Telephone Company ("PTC Petition") (May 15, 1997). Pursuant to D.C. Code Ann. § 43-904 (b) (1998) and 15 D.C.M.R. §140.5, the Commission was required to issue an order on reconsideration by June 15, 1997. However, by subsequent orders, the Commission extended the reconsideration period.

4 Petition at 5-10.

5 TT97-5, Letter from Cecelia T. Roudiez of Bell Atlantic-Washington, D. C., Inc., to Jesse P. Clay, Jr., Commission Secretary, filed May 28, 1997. See TT97-11, In The Matter of the Application of Bell Atlantic-Washington, D.C., Inc., for Authority to Amend the Local Exchange Services Tariff, P.S.C.-D.C.- No. 202., Application of Bell Atlantic-Washington, D.C. Inc., to reduce the monthly recurring charges for Line Side Answer Supervision and Call Screening features that are available as options with Pay Telephone Lines, filed May 19, 1997. Also, BA-DC on July 29, 1999, in TT97-5, filed additional revised cost data. See TT97-5, Letter from J. Henry Ambrose of Bell Atlantic-Washington, D.C., Inc., to Jesse P. Clay, Jr., Commission Secretary, filed July 29, 1999.

6 Application, Attachment I Section 4D, Original Page 1.

The FCC's payphone orders not only require that LEC payphone providers ensure that their services are cost based and nondiscriminatory, but also require States to ensure that payphone costs for unregulated equipment and subsidies are removed from intrastate local exchange service and exchange access service rates.[7] The FCC also directed States to apply these requirements, along with a "new services" test which mandates that cost-based rates may not exceed the level necessary to recover direct costs of the service plus an appropriate level of overhead costs.[8] In addition, the FCC directed LECs to amend their State tariff to comply with FCC rules and stated that, when they did so, the LECs must also file a study containing a projection of costs and estimates of the effect of the new tariff on the traffic and revenues for a representative 12 month period.[9]

The Commission's April 15, 1997 Order approving this tariff found that the price of BA-DC payphone services is in excess of the cost of providing it and would generate a positive incremental margin to cover overhead costs.[10] Although this determination may satisfy the cost based requirement under the FCC's payphone orders, we agree with PTC that it does not meet the "new services" test which prohibits cost based rates from exceeding the level necessary to recover direct costs of the service plus an appropriate level of overhead costs. Therefore, we must now consider whether BA-DC's rates satisfy the "new services" test.

In TT97-11, BA-DC provided the following revised cost data pertaining to its NCCL, NCNL and COCOT line services:

1) Rate reductions for Line Side Answer Supervision and Call Screening features from monthly rates of $1.50 to $0.15 and zero, respectively;

2) Elimination of Audiotex Call Blocking Services;

3) Elimination of Line Usage Charges; and,

4) Elimination of white pages and a regulation change made to align the change for this service with that of other business subscribers.[11]

---

7 Payphone Orders (Reconsideration Order) at ¶ 163.

8 Amendments of Part 69 of the Commission's Rules Relating to the Creation of Access Charge Subelements for Open Network Architecture, CC Docket No. 89-79, 6 FCC Rcd 4524, 4531 (1991).

9 47 CFR Section 61.49(h).

10 TT97-5, Order No. 10967 at 7.

11 TT97-11, In The Matter of the Application of Bell Atlantic-Washington, D.C., Inc., for

(continued...)

The Commission, after reviewing this revised cost data and other data submitted by BA-DC, finds that BA-DC's rates comply with the FCC's "new services" test and that BA-DC is not subsidizing its payphone services. The Commission further finds that BA-DC has provided sufficient revised cost data which demonstrates that the revenues received from its NCCL, NCNL and COCOTS services will only cover the incremental costs of providing the services, and that BA-DC has eliminated the possibility that its payphone operations will be subsidized directly or indirectly from exchange or exchange access services.

We note that, on January 31, 1997, the Commission approved TT96-18,[12] a tariff in which BA-DC requested authority to establish prices and regulations for Network Controlled Inmate Line ("NCIL") Service (a payphone line used to provide basic inmate services).[13] In approving TT96-18, the Commission did not determine whether the rates for the service satisfy the "new services" test. Although that decision has not been appealed, we feel compelled to reconsider that order in light of our decision in the tariff before us today. As our Order issued simultaneous reflects, after reviewing the data submitted in TT97-11, we find that NCIL's rates satisfy the "new services" test and that NCIL is not subsidized either directly or indirectly from exchange or exchange access services.[14]

---

[11](...continued)
Authority to Amend the Local Exchange Services Tariff, P.S.C.-D.C.- No. 202 , Application of Bell Atlantic-Washington, D.C. Inc., to reduce the monthly recurring charges for Line Side Answer Supervision and Call Screening features that are available as options with Pay Telephone Lines, filed May 19, 1997.

[12] TT96-18, In the Matter of the Application of Bell Atlantic - Washington, D.C., Inc. for Authority to Amend the Local Exchange Services Tariff, P.S.C. - D.C. - No.. 202 and General Services Tariff, P.S.C.-D.C. No. 203, Order No. 10919 (January 31, 1997).

[13] NCIL is a switched access exchange service for use with coinless telephones provided on the premises of city and Federal prisons where institutionally authorized telephone programs warrant the service. NCIL Service can be arranged for coinless one-way calling (outgoing calls only) and two-way calling.

[14] In a separate Order in TT97-11, we also found that the cost data submitted by BA-DC pertaining to its NCCL, NCNL and COCOT line services complies with the "new services" test. See TT97-11, Order No. 11542 (November 16, 1999).

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED THAT:

1. PTC's Petition is granted; and

2. The Commission's decision in Order No. 10967 is modified consistent with our decision in this Order.

A TRUE COPY: **BY DIRECTION OF THE COMMISSION:**

Jesse P. Clay Jr.

CHIEF CLERK **JESSE P. CLAY, JR.**
COMMISSION SECRETARY

APPENDIX C

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION 010520200

AT RICHMOND, MAY 11, 2001

PETITION OF

CASE NO. PUC970029

PAYTEL COMMUNICATIONS, INC.,
PEOPLES TELEPHONE COMPANY, INC., and
PHON TEL TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

For rejection of and investigation of tariffs filed by Virginia local exchange carriers pursuant to § 276 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996

FINAL ORDER

On March 21, 1997, PayTel Communications, Inc. ("PayTel"), Peoples Telephone Company ("Peoples Telephone"), Phon Tel Technologies, Inc. ("Phone Tel"), and Communications Central, Inc. ("Communications Central"),[1] (collectively, the "Payphone Service Providers" or "PSPs") filed with the State Corporation Commission ("Commission") their Motion to reject tariffs filed by certain named Virginia incumbent local exchange companies ("ILECs")[2] and Petition asking the Commission to investigate, determine, and establish cost-based rates for basic payphone services ("Motion to Reject and Petition"). The tariffs were

[1] Communications Central withdrew from this proceeding on April 24, 1998, and requested that its name be removed from the caption.

[2] The Motion and Petition specifically addressed proposed payphone tariffs filed by Bell Atlantic-Virginia, Inc. n/k/a Verizon Virginia Inc. ("Verizon Virginia"), GTE South Incorporated n/k/a Verizon South Inc. ("Verizon South"), United Telephone-Southeast, Inc. ("United"), and Central Telephone Company of Virginia ("Centel"). Proposed payphone tariffs also were filed by Clifton Forge-Waynesboro Telephone Company n/k/a NTELOS ("NTELOS") and TDS subsidiaries, Amelia Telephone Company ("Amelia"), New Castle Telephone Company ("New Castle"), and Virginia Telephone Company.

filed by the ILECs pursuant to § 276 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the "Act")[3] and pursuant to implementing orders of the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC").[4]

Section 276 of the Act required the FCC to "establish a per call compensation plan to ensure that all [PSPs] are fairly compensated for each and every completed intrastate and interstate call using their payphone . . .".[5] Section 276 of the Act also prohibited a Bell operating company ("BOC") from subsidizing its payphone operations with its telephone exchange service or exchange access operations and prohibited discrimination in favor of the BOC's payphone service.[6] In addition, § 276 of the Act directed the FCC to "discontinue the intrastate and interstate carrier access charge payphone service elements and payments . . . and all intrastate and interstate payphone subsidies from basic exchange and exchange access

---

[3] 47 U.S.C. § 276.

[4] Implementation of the Pay Phone Telephone Reclassification and Compensation Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, CC Docket No. 96-128, Report and Order, 11 F.C.C.R. 20541 (1996) (hereafter "Report and Order"); and Order on Reconsideration, 11 F.C.C.R. 21233 (1996) (hereafter "Order on Reconsideration"), aff'd in part and remanded in part, sub nom. Illinois Public Telecommunications Assn. v. F.C.C., 117 F.3d 555 (D.C. Cir. 1997). The FCC issued its Third Report and Order and Order on Reconsideration of the Second Report and Order, 14 F.C.C.R. 2545 (1999), to reestablish how PSPs should be compensated for "dial around" calls, following the court's supplemental opinion, clarifying the portions of the FCC's Report and Order and Order on Reconsideration that were vacated. 123 F.3d 693 (D.C. Cir. 1997).

[5] 47 U.S.C. § 276(b)(1)(A).

[6] 47 U.S.C. § 276(a).

revenues . . . [and to] prescribe a set of nonstructural safeguards for [BOC] payphone service . . .".[7]

In its Report and Order released September 20, 1996, and Order on Reconsideration released November 8, 1996, the FCC adopted regulatory requirements for the payphone industry to implement § 276 of the Act. Among other things, the Report and Order and Order on Reconsideration directed LECs to file intrastate tariffs for basic payphone lines used for basic payphone services. Such tariffs were required to be: (1) market based, (2) nondiscriminatory, and (3) consistent with the requirements of § 276 of the Act.[8]

On March 28, 1997, the Commission issued its Order Authorizing Interim Rates and Initiating Investigation. Among other things, the proposed payphone tariffs of Verizon Virginia, Verizon South, United, Centel, NTELOS, New Castle, and Virginia Telephone Company were ordered to take effect subject to investigation and refund if the Commission ultimately determined that different rates were to be imposed. The Commission's Order of March 28, 1997, also cautioned that by allowing the proposed tariffs to take effect, it was not indicating or implying that

---

[7] 47 U.S.C. § 276(b)(1)(B), (C).

[8] See Order on Reconsideration at Paragraph 163. The FCC later issued an order clarifying that the intrastate tariffs must satisfy the requirements applied to new interstate access services proposed by incumbent LECs subject to price cap regulation, the so-called new services test of the Computer III tariffing guidelines. Implementation of the Pay Phone Telephone Reclassification and Compensation Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, CC Docket No. 96-128, Report and Order, 12 F.C.C.R. 21370 (1997).

these tariffs were determined to be in compliance with § 276 of the Act or with the FCC's Report and Order and Order on Reconsideration.

Subsequent to the Commission's March 28, 1997, Order, the Commission joined other state regulatory commissions and the National Association of the State Utility Consumer Advocates ("NASUCA") in seeking review of a portion of the FCC's Report and Order and Order on Reconsideration. The state regulatory commissions and NASUCA argued on appeal that the Act did not give the FCC authority to preempt the states' power to regulate local coin rates.[9]

The Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit held that the Act did authorize the FCC to set local coin rates for payphones.[10] The Court of Appeals stated that when Congress directed the FCC to ensure that PSPs were fairly compensated for each and every completed intrastate and interstate call, it did not intend to exclude local coin rates from the term "compensation." Rather, the term "compensation" was intended to encompass rates paid by callers in the form of coins deposited into phones.[11] Therefore, according to the Court of Appeals, § 276 of the Act unambiguously granted the FCC the authority to

---

[9] Illinois Public Telecommunications Ass'n. v. F.C.C., 117 F.3d 555, 561 (D.C. Cir. 1997), decision clarified on reh'g, 123 F.3d 693 (D.C. Cir. 1997), cert. denied, 523 U.S. 1046 (1998).

[10] Id. at 562.

[11] Id.

regulate local coin call rates. The FCC chose to ensure that PSPs were "fairly compensated" by completely deregulating the rates, allowing PSPs to establish rates at the price the market would bear for such local calls.

In sum, by virtue of the Act, the FCC has directly preempted the Commission's historic authority over local coin call rates as well as certain other intrastate payphone rates and services. This preemption, therefore, means that the Commission cannot investigate the proposed intrastate tariffs independent of the FCC's Report and Order and Order on Reconsideration. The FCC regulations attempt to place significant regulatory responsibilities on state commissions, including this Commission. In this case, the FCC regulations, among other things, would require us to evaluate the proposed intrastate tariffs for compliance with FCC regulations regardless of whether they are consistent with this Commission's rules and practices.[12] We find this an awkward, if not an unworkable, prospect. These responsibilities delegated by the FCC attempt to impose upon the Commonwealth, in its sovereign capacity, a role pursuant to § 276 of the Act that is in violation of the Tenth Amendment. The Tenth Amendment has been

[12] On November 24, 1993, the Commission adopted Regulations for Pay Telephone Service and Instruments ("Pay Telephone Rules") pursuant to Va. Code §§ 56-508.15 and 56-508.16 (20 VAC 5-400-90). Among other requirements, these rules established the pricing requirements for local exchange carriers' payphone access lines. In addition, the pricing of Basic Local Exchange Services (including payphone lines) of Verizon Virginia, Verizon South, United, and Centel are controlled by the Alternative Regulatory Plans for these companies approved by this Commission.

broadly interpreted to prohibit the federal government from compelling states or state officials to implement federal regulatory programs through state actions.[13] Moreover, the Commission can only act as authorized by the Constitution of Virginia and state statute.[14] Its jurisdiction must be found either in constitutional grants or in statutes that do not contravene the Constitution of Virginia.[15] The Commission does not have the authority independent of our Constitution and state statutes to strictly assist the FCC in fulfilling the FCC's statutory and regulatory duties.

The FCC's Order on Reconsideration provides that:

> States unable to review these tariffs may require the LECs operating in their state to file these tariffs with the [FCC] Commission. (para. 163)

The FCC retains jurisdiction under § 276 of the Act "to ensure that all requirements of section 276 and the Payphone Reclassification Proceeding are met."[16] That being so, we decline to assist the FCC further in this instance.

THEREFORE, upon consideration of this matter, the Commission finds that the proposed payphone tariffs filed with

---

[13] See New York v. United States, 505 U.S. 144; 112 S. Ct. 2408 (1992); Printz v. United States, 521 U.S. 898; 117 S. Ct. 2365 (1997).

[14] Va. Const. art. IX, § 2.

[15] City of Norfolk v. Virginia Electric and Power Company, 197 Va. 505; 90 S.E.2d 140 (1955).

[16] In the Matter of Wisconsin Public Service Commission Order Directing Filings, CCB/CPD Docket No. 00-1, DA00-347, 15 F.C.C.R. 9978 (2000).

this Commission shall for the present time remain in effect. However, any party may directly request the FCC to require the ILECs to file payphone tariffs with the FCC which comply with § 276 of the Act.

The Commission declines to further investigate the proposed payphone tariffs and dismisses this docketed proceeding without prejudice.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED THAT this matter is DISMISSED and, there being nothing further to come before the Commission, the papers filed herein shall be placed in the file for ended causes.

AN ATTESTED COPY hereof shall be sent by the Clerk of the Commission to: Edward L. Petrini, Esquire, Christian & Barton, 909 East Main Street, Suite 1200, Richmond, Virginia 23219-3095; Magalie R. Salas, Esquire, Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20554; all local exchange carriers certificated in Virginia, as shown on Appendix A attached hereto; all interexchange carriers certificated in Virginia, as shown on Appendix B attached hereto; Earl Bishop, Executive Vice President, Virginia Telecommunications Industry Association, 11 South 12th Street, Suite 310, Richmond, Virginia 23219; Atlantic Payphone Associates, 1506 North Ivanhoe Street, Arlington, Virginia 22205; John F. Dudley, Senior Assistant Attorney General, Division of Consumer Counsel, Office of

Attorney General, 900 East Main Street, Second Floor, Richmond, Virginia 23219; and the Commission's Divisions of Communications, Public Utility Accounting, and Economics and Finance.

A True Copy
Teste:

Clerk of the
State Corporation Commission

APPENDIX D

PAY TELEPHONE LINES (PTL)

A. GENERAL

Pay Telephone Lines (PTL) are individual dial tone line Local Exchange services for use by pay phone service providers to connect coin, coinless and/or combination coin/coinless pay telephones to the Telephone Company's network.

B. REGULATIONS

1. Three types of PTL are available: Network Controlled Coin Line (NCCL), Network Controlled Non-Coin Line (NCNL), and Customer-Provided Coin and Credit Card-Operated Telephones (COCOTS).

2. Explanations of Terms

   Network Controlled Coin Line (NCCL)

   Network Controlled Coin Line (NCCL) is a dial tone line, message rate, Local Exchange service for use with coin-operated pay telephones.*

   The NCCL is equipped with network coin control capability which includes coin collect and return features, call rating capabilities and unique operator services which allow an end user to signal the operator during a call.

   Network Controlled Non-Coin Line (NCNL)

   Network Controlled Non-Coin Line (NCNL) is an individual Local Exchange service for use with non-coin/coinless pay telephones, including card reader or credit card telephones. The NCNL prevents the completion of chargeable direct-dialed local or chargeable direct-dialed toll calls without operator intervention.

   Customer-provided Coin and Credit Card-Operated Telephones (COCOTS)

   Customer-provided Coin and Credit Card-Operated Telephones (COCOTS) is an individual line, message rated, Local Exchange Service designed for use with station controlled pay telephones which may be used by the general public.

   Call Screening, when used in connection with COCOTS, is an optional arrangement whereby outgoing calls, which are routed to a Telephone Company operator, will be processed only on a bill-to-third number, collect call or calling card basis as instructed by the calling party.

* Local messages will be billed on a flat rate basis until a message rate exchange line is technically feasible for coin-operated telephones. At that time, all NCCL lines equipped with flat rate service will convert to a message rate exchange line.

PAY TELEPHONE LINES (PTL)

B. REGULATIONS (Cont'd)

3. NCCL and NCNL may be provisioned as Two-way or One-way, Outgoing Only exchange lines.

4. NCCL and NCNL exchange lines prevent the completion of incoming collect or third number calls, when such calls originate within the continental United States and when such calls are processed through the billing verification database. Outgoing operator-handled calls are restricted to collect, third number and calling card only.

5. Directory listings are not available with NCCL One-way, Outgoing Only or NCNL One-way, Outgoing Only exchange lines.

6. Directory listings are available with NCCL Two-way, NCNL Two-way and COCOTS exchange lines subject to the regulations applicable to listings for individual line business service.

7. The following options are available for NCCL, NCNL and COCOTS exchange lines where facilities permit:

   a. Audiotex Call Blocking - prevents the completion of direct-dialed outgoing calls placed directly to an Audiotex Service telephone number and is subject to the rates specified in Section 9A of this Tariff. Audiotex Service telephone numbers will be processed only when routed through a Telephone Company operator.

   b. 700/900 Call Restriction - subject to the regulations and rates specified in the General Services Tariff, Section 6.

8. Pay Telephones connected to a PTL exchange line must be registered in compliance with Part 68 of the FCC's Registration Program.

PAY TELEPHONE LINES (PTL)

B. REGULATIONS (Cont'd)

9. Line Side Answer Supervision may be provided on NCNL and COCOTS exchange lines. This optional feature detects and provides signaling to activate billing mechanisms upon connection of a call and deactivate billing mechanisms when the call is terminated.

10. In addition to the regulations specified in the Telephone Company's Connection With Telephone Company Facilities Tariff, this service will be provided only when used to connect telephones which comply with generally accepted telephone telecommunications industry technical standards, the current National Electrical Code and National Electrical Safety Code.

11. Only one pay telephone will be permitted to be connected to each PTL exchange line. Extensions must be configured and wired so that only one telephone will operate on the line at one time.

12. A PTL subscriber may request that the exchange line be arranged for Touch-Tone Calling Service available at the business line rate specified in Section 3 of this Tariff.

13. PTL Subscribers are subject to the same Directory Assistance rates applicable to business service specified in the General Services Tariff, Section 9.

14. Nonpublished and Nonlisted Telephone Service described in the General Services Tariff will be provided at no charge upon PTL subscriber request.

15. Pay telephones connected to a PTL exchange line must be arranged to permit the customer's patrons to place calls to Universal Emergency Number 911 Service, the Telephone Company's directory assistance service by dialing 4-1-1 and the Telephone Company's operator by dialing 0 without charge and without depositing a coin. When a pay telephone can complete a call to Universal Emergency Number 911 Service only by use of a dialing sequence other than 9-1-1, that dialing sequence must be prominently displayed on the pay telephone.

16. Pay telephones connected to a PTL exchange line must be arranged to permit access to toll free telephone numbers.

17. NCCL exchange lines may not be programmed to limit the duration of a local message.

18. Pay telephones connected to a PTL exchange line must comply with all applicable federal and local laws and regulations concerning use by disabled persons and the hearing impaired.

PAY TELEPHONE LINES (PTL)

B. REGULATIONS (Cont'd)

19. The PTL subscriber shall be responsible for the installation, operation and maintenance of any pay telephone used in connection with this service.

20. The PTL subscriber shall be responsible for payment of all charges, including applicable local, toll and FCC charges associated with the provisioning of this service.

    Failure of the subscriber to comply with the provisions of this Tariff may result in penalties described in D.C. Code 43-307 for failure to comply with the Public Service Commission's Rules and Regulations.

21. Long Distance Message Restriction is available for NCNL on an optional basis, subject to the regulations and rates specified for NCNL for business in the General Services Tariff, Section 6.

PAY TELEPHONE LINES (PTL)

C. RATES

1. The local service area and applicable local messages are as specified for a business, message rate, individual line in Section 2 of this Tariff.

	Nonrecurring Charge	Per Month	
2. Pay Telephone Lines (PTL), each			
a. NCCL (Coin)			
One-way, Outgoing Only......................	-	$18.58	
Two-way Service............................	-	16.58	
b. NCNL (Non-Coin)			
One-way, Outgoing Only......................	-	26.00	
Two-way Service............................	-	24.00	
c. COCOTS	-	11.00	(R)
3. Line Side Answer Supervision....................	$11.12*	.15	
4. COCOTS, Optional Features			
a. Call Screening, per line associated....................	-	.00	

* Applies if installation occurs subsequent to the installation of the line and is in addition to standard service charges.

APPENDIX E

PAY TELEPHONE LINES (PTL)

A. GENERAL

Pay Telephone Lines (PTL) are individual dial tone line Local Exchange services for use by pay phone service providers to connect coin, coinless or combination coin/coinless pay telephones to the Telephone Company's network.

B. REGULATIONS

1. Four types of PTL are available: Network Controlled Coin Line (NCCL), Network Controlled Non-Coin Line (NCNL), Network Controlled Inmate Line (NCIL), and Customer-provided Coin and Credit Card Operated Telephones (COCOTS).

2. Explanations of Terms

   Network Controlled Coin Line (NCCL)

   Network Controlled Coin Line (NCCL) is a dial tone line, message or measured rate, Local Exchange service for use with coin-operated pay telephones.

   The NCCL is equipped with network coin control capability which includes coin collect and return features, call rating capabilities and unique operator services which allow an end user to signal the operator during a call.

   Network Controlled Non-Coin Line (NCNL)

   Network Controlled Non-Coin Line (NCNL) is a dial tone line Local Exchange service for use with non-coin pay telephones, including card reader or credit card telephones. This line prevents the completion of chargeable direct-dialed local or chargeable direct-dialed toll calls without operator intervention.

   Network Controlled Inmate Line (NCIL)

   The Network Controlled Inmate Line (NCIL) is a dial tone line Local Exchange service for use with coinless and coin-operated telephones provided on the premises of city, county, state or federal prisons where institutionally authorized telephone programs warrant the service.

   NCIL is provided for the purpose of originating: collect messages from coinless telephones and collect and local sent-paid messages from coin-operated telephones to numbers in the Telephone Company's North American Dialing Plan.

PAY TELEPHONE LINES (PTL)

B. REGULATIONS (Cont'd)

Network Controlled Inmate Line (NCIL) (Cont'd)

Calls to Telephone Company numbers such as repair service, directory assistance, live operator (0-), Toll Free numbers, 10XXX or 101XXXX, and public emergency service numbers such as 911 will be blocked from all Network Controlled Inmate Lines.

The following are standard blocking/screening features of the NCIL service:

(1) Toll Billing Exception - is an inward screening that disallows the billing of collect or third number calls to the line.

(2) Originating Line Number Toll Screening - provides special screening codes to the operator identifying any outward call screening on the line.

(3) 700/900 blocking - prevents an exchange user from accessing 700 and 900 service telephone numbers.

Customer-provided Coin and Credit Card Operated Telephone Service (COCOTS)

Customer-provided Coin and Credit Card Operated Telephone Service (COCOTS) is a dial tone line, message or measured rated, Local Exchange service designed for use with station controlled pay telephones.

Call Screening, when used in connection with COCOTS, is an optional arrangement whereby outgoing calls, which are routed to a Telephone Company operator, will be processed only on a bill-to-third number, collect call or calling card basis, as instructed by the calling party.

3. NCCL and NCNL pay telephone exchange lines may be provisioned as Two-way or One-way, Outgoing Only exchange lines.

4. NCCL and NCNL pay telephone exchange lines prevent the completion of incoming collect or third number calls, when such calls originate within the continental United States and when such calls are processed through the billing verification database. Outgoing operator-handled calls are restricted to collect, third number and calling card only.

5. Directory Listings are not available with One-way, Outgoing Only NCCL or One-way, Outgoing Only NCNL pay telephone exchange lines.

6. Directory listings are available with NCCL Two-way, NCNL Two-way, and COCOTS pay telephone lines subject to the regulations applicable to listings for individual line business service.

* NCCL will be billed on an unlimited flat rate basis until message and measured rate exchange lines are technically feasible for coin-operated telephones. At that time, all NCCL lines equipped with flat rate service will convert to a message or measured rate exchange line.

PAY TELEPHONE LINES (PTL)

B. REGULATIONS (Cont'd)

7. NCCL, NCNL, and COCOTS exchange lines may be provided with 700/900 Call Restriction as an optional feature, subject to the regulations and rates specified in the General Services Tariff, Section 6.

8. Line Side Answer Supervision may be provided on NCNL and COCOTS exchange lines. This is an optional feature that detects and provides signaling to activate billing mechanisms upon connection of a call and deactivate billing mechanisms when the call is terminated.

9. Pay telephones connected to a PTL exchange line must be registered in compliance with Part 68 of the FCC's Code of Regulations.

(D)

10. NCCL, NCNL, and COCOTS subscribers are subject to the same Directory Assistance rates applicable to business service specified in the General Services Tariff, Section 9. (T)

11. Exchange users of NCCL, NCNL, and COCOTS must be permitted access at no charge to Universal Emergency Number 911 Services, the Telephone Company's operator, Toll Free Service numbers and Switched Access Service Feature Group B without charge. (T)

12. Pay telephones connected to a PTL exchange line must be arranged to permit the completion of long distance calls and calls within the local service area where the service is located. Pay telephones connected to NCCL exchange lines must be arranged to return deposited coins on incompleted outgoing calls. (T)

13. Nonpublished and Nonlisted Telephone Service described in the General Services Tariff will be provided at no charge upon the PTL subscriber's request. (T)

14. Failure of the subscriber to comply with the provisions of this Tariff may result in the suspension or disconnection of the subscriber's service. (T)

15. The PTL subscriber shall be responsible for the installation, operation and maintenance of any pay telephone used in connection with this service. (T)

16. The PTL subscriber shall be responsible for payment of all charges, including applicable local, toll and FCC charges, associated with the provisioning of this service. (T)

PAY TELEPHONE LINES (PTL)

B. REGULATIONS (Cont'd)

17. Long Distance Message Restriction, which is a detariffed service, is available on an optional basis for NCNL. (T)

18. NCIL may be provisioned as a: (T)

(1) Coin One-way, Outgoing Mechanized Collect Access Line.*

(2) Coinless One-way, Outgoing Mechanized Collect Only Access Line.

(3) Coinless Two-way access line.

C. RATES

1. The applicable local message charges and exchange areas for PTL exchange lines are as specified for business in Section 2 of this Tariff.

2. All sent-paid intraLATA toll calls will be handled by the Telephone Company and charged at the appropriate rate specified in the Long Distance Services Tariff, Section 2B for Operator Services or FCC No. 4 Tariff.

   Any sent-paid intraLATA toll call that is not rated by the Telephone Company will be charged at the rate specified in the Long Distance Services Tariff, Section 2A for Business Two-point Service.

3. The Service Charges for PTL are specified in the General Services Tariff, Section 3.

4. The monthly NCCL dial tone line rate is the same in each rate class. The monthly NCNL dial tone rate is the same in each rate class.

5. The monthly dial tone line charges for Customer-provided Coin and Credit Card Operated Telephones (COCOTS) are specified in Section 2 of this Tariff.

* Coin NCIL is provisioned the same as the coinless NCIL (One-way, Outgoing Only Mechanized Collect Only), except local sent-paid messages are permitted.

PAY TELEPHONE LINES (PTL)

C. RATES (Cont'd)

6. PTL exchange lines*, each

	Nonrecurring Charge	Per Month
a. NCCL (Coin)		
One-way, Outgoing Only....................	-	$23.11
Two-way Service...........................	-	21.11
b. NCNL (Non-Coin)		
One-way, Outgoing Only....................	-	33.00
Two-way Service...........................	-	31.00
c. NCIL (Non-Coin)		
One-way, Outgoing Only....................	-	32.00
Two-way Service...........................	-	30.00
NCIL (Coin)		
One-way, Outgoing Only....................	-	55.00
d. COCOTS (Rates are as specified in Section 2 of this Tariff.)		
7. Line Side Answer Supervision, each..	$11.12##	0.15
8. COCOTS, Optional Features, Call Screening, per line associated..................................	-	.00

* The monthly rate is the same in each of the eight Rate Classes, except for COCOTS.

Applies if installation occurs subsequent to the installation of the line and is in addition to standard service charges.

APPENDIX F

Verizon Services and Equipment Information

•Verizon Products and Services

Following is the Detail of Recurring Monthly Charges for Informational Purposes.
Total Charges Due appear on Page 1 of your bill.

•Products and Services - Account Level

	Description		Qty	SRC	Initiation Date	Tax LSFR	Amount
1.	Cramming Block For Carrier Services	#	1		8/20/86	EEEE	.00

•Products and Services - Individual Line(s)

•Location Group: 00000 1725 DESALES ST NW
WASHINGTON DC

202 887-9242

	Description		Qty	SRC	Initiation Date	Tax LSFR	Amount
2.	Coin - Two Way Message Rated Service - SCL Interlata Carrier Name (PIC) VEN Intralata Carrier Name (LPIC) NONE	#	1		4/8/02	EEEE	11.15
3.	Coin Line - Call Modifier Screening	#	1		6/5/00	EEEE	.00
4.	Deny Three Way		1		8/20/86	EEEE	.00
5.	Federal Subscriber Line Charge Multi Line		1		7/3/01	LEEE	3.87
6.	Federal Universal Service Fund Surcharge Multi Line		1		4/2/02	EEEE	.65
7.	FLEX ANI Charge	#	1		11/1/00	EEEE	.00
8.	Local Number Portability Surcharge		1		12/1/00	LEEE	.23
9.	Touch Tone		1		6/5/00	EEEE	.00
10.	Collect And Third Number Blocking		1		8/20/86	EEEE	.00
11.	International Call Block		1		6/5/00	EEEE	.00
12.	Non-Published Service		1		8/20/86	EEEE	.00

Tax Codes:							
	L	Local	F	Federal	E	Exempt
	S	State	R	Local Surcharge		

**Indicates charges for non-regulated product(s) or service(s)**

continues

APPENDIX G

[redacted]

verizon

Make progress every day

Telephone Number: 703 491-3485
Account Number: 000131068885 66Y
How to Reach Us: See page 2

Verizon Services and Equipment Information

•Summary of Services

Following is a Summary of Recurring Monthly Charges for Informational Purposes.
Total Charges Due appear on Page 1 of your bill.

•Monthly Service

Description		Qty	Tag	Amount
1. Coin - Two Way Measured Service - SCL	#	1		18.09
2. Coin Line - Call Modifier Screening	#	1		.30
3. Deny Three Way	#	1		.00
4. Federal Subscriber Line Charge Multi Line		1		9.20
5. Listed Service		1		.00
6. Operator Screening	#	1		.26
7. Audiotex Call Restriction Service		1		.00
8. Collect And Third Number Blocking		1		.00
9. Deny * 69		1		.00
10. Deny Repeat Dialing		1		.00
11. International Call Block		1		.00
12. 700/900 Call Restriction Service		1		.00
				27.85

Total Summary of Services **$27.85**

Tax Codes:	L	Local	F	Federal	E	Exempt
	S	State	R	Local Surcharge		

 # Indicates charges for non-regulated product(s) or service(s)